DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 271 TM 011 875

TITLE Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection Process in the Chicago Public Schools.
INSTITUTION Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Oct 86
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Bias; *Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Material Evaluation; Instructional Materials; Mail Surveys; *Media Selection; Principals; *Racial Bias; School Policy; Social Bias; Teacher Attitudes; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

The relationship between Board of Education policy designed to promote cultural, ethnic, and racial understanding, and the instructional materials most widely available and used in the Chicago (Illinois) Public Schools was studied. Teachers, district administrators, and principals were surveyed to understand the process of selecting and evaluating instructional materials for racial, social, ethnic, and cultural bias. More specifically, 53 teachers served on instructional materials evaluation committees from October 1984 to May 1985 and were surveyed concerning their views regarding judging materials on bias factors. Surveys were administered to 15 district offices and questionnaires were mailed and received from 370 elementary and 52 high school principals and teachers. Both of these surveys focused on the structure developed by each school district to evaluate and select materials, the level of staff involvement, and information needs. Teachers were often unfamiliar with guidelines and criteria for selection. Time constraints limited review of materials before selection. Adequate training must be provided teachers serving on selection and evaluation committees. Specific guidelines and procedures are needed by all involved in the selection process. Follow-ups will be necessary to monitor progress in improving materials. Appendices contain teacher and administrator survey results and questionnaires. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299271

Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection Process in the Chicago Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CAROLE PERLMAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

October 1986

TM011825

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION PROCESS IN THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

October 1986

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, handicaps unrelated to ability, or sex in its educational program or employment policies or practices.

BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF CHICAGO

Mr. George Munoz, President
Mr. William M. Farrow, Vice-President

Clark Burrus
Ms. Linda Coronado
Ms. Frances Davis
Frank W. Gardner
Mrs. Mattie Hopkins
Mrs. Patricia OHern
Michael Penn
Mrs. Winnie Slusser
Mrs. Myrna E. Salazar

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Bryd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

Howard Denton
Assistant to the General Superintendent

Irving M. Brauer
Director of Projects
Department of Research and Evaluation

October 1986

Table of Contents

PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....vii

Teacher Committees and the Central Review Process.....viii
District Administrators and the Review Process.....x
Local Schools and the Review Process.....xi
The Review Process Overall.....xii

INTRODUCTION.....1

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION IN PERSPECTIVE.....5

TEACHER COMMITTTEES ASSESS THEIR ROLE IN INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION.....7

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS ASSESS THE PROCESS OF INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION.....13

PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS ASSESS THE PROCESS OF INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION.....17

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS.....21

Teacher Committees and the Review Process.....21
Recommendations.....23

District Staff and the Review Process.....24
Recommendations.....24

Local Schools and the Review Process.....25
Recommendations.....26

General Conclusions.....26
Recommendations.....27

REFERENCES.....29

APPENDICES.....31

A - Schedule for Evaluating/Selecting Instruction Materials.....33
B - Instruction Materials Evaluation Committee Participant Questionnaire.....35
C - General Selection Criteria.....41
D - Evaluation Criteria for Nontextuals.....43
E - Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection Administrator Questionnaire.....45
F - Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection School Administrator/Staff Questionnaire.....49

Executive Summary

The 1981 document titled, "Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendation on Educational Components" (CBOE) contained a recommendation to "assess the instructional materials in all schools for evidence of cultural bias. Replace biased materials with materials that are pluralistic in orientation." The Department of Research and Evaluation proposed to conduct a study that examined the relationship between Board of Education policy designed to promote cultural, ethnic and racial understanding and the instruction materials most widely available and used by Chicago Public School (CPS) teachers and students. In the original proposal several methods and stages were suggested that would initiate the process of evaluating instruction materials in relation to CPS curricular and anti-discrimination goals. The objective of this initial phase was to obtain descriptive information regarding the evaluation/selection process as it currently operates. (Note: throughout this report the phrase "bias factors" refers to obvious or subtle characteristics of instruction materials (textual and nontextual) which could be construed to discriminate against cultural, ethnic, gender, racial or religious groups.)

Toward this end, several audiences were identified to be surveyed during the 1984-85 school year: 1) teachers appointed or selected to serve on evaluation/selection committees at the central office level, 2) district administrative staff and 3) principals and teachers in each elementary and high school. This report will describe the process of getting instruction materials into the classroom and identify the reported level of teacher,

principal and administrator involvement. The primary findings of each survey were analyzed and used to formulate recommendations for future action.

Teacher Committees and the Central Review Process

Fifty-three teachers were selected either by district superintendents, principals, curriculum directors or the Bureau of Instruction Materials (BIM) to serve on review committees to evaluate materials for the "Approved List" during the 1984-85 school year. Teacher Committees were comprised of primarily three racial groups, which though representative of the CPS student population, did not fully reflect its ethnic, cultural and racial diversity. These committees consisted of teachers who were experienced in their respective grade levels or subject areas. Three-fourths of the teachers had little formal training in instruction materials evaluation/selection but relied upon their acquired experience at local schools in the performance of these tasks. This kind of experience though helpful still needed to be supplemented; a one-day orientation was provided because the skills needed for evaluating materials to prepare the "Approved List" differ from those used to select materials for a local school. Following the orientation session, two-thirds of the teachers reported an understanding of their role on the committee. However, over 90 percent agreed that this role was understood after the committee's work started. Unfortunately, teachers' ability to conduct quality reviews were constrained by limitations of time.

An examination of the selection criteria used to assess materials on bias factors suggests some ambiguities in how the criteria are to be defined, opening up the process to individual interpretation and application of the criteria. For the six criteria that refers to bias factors, serious questions arise as to the operational definitions of such phrases as "scholarly

research", "role of women in history and society" and various kinds of stereotypes.

The one day orientation teacher received, as observed by evaluators, did not adequately define thesee issues sufficiently for teachers to exercise fair judgement regarding bias in instruction materials. In general, although it would appear that teachers on the review committees would have difficulty using the criteria, the majority of teachers rated the criteria as adequate for accomplishing their committee tasks. However, a third of the teachers indicated that the materials approved by the committee would still require teacher discretion in addressing bias factors. Data from school administrators indicate that current practice does not support this concern since eighty percent of the schools reported that criteria for considering bias factors were not included in their local school review.

Survey analyses, document reviews, and interviews and discussions with teachers and administrators provided material for the following recommendations:

- Insure that teachers who are selected to serve on instruction materials evaluation/selection committees have received training in this process.
- Develop a course of study in the skill of evaluating/selecting instruction materials, utilizing university resources, with credit toward lane placement for teachers who qualify.
- Require that skill in instruction materials evaluation/selection be a prerequisite for teachers who develop the "approved list" that governs the regular instructional program.
- Restructure the way teachers are scheduled to serve on evaluation/selection committees to alleviate the workload and provide teachers with sufficient time to do quality reviews.
- Reinstitute teacher committees to work during the summer session to prevent disruption to the instructional program and enable the work to be accomplished in a less pressured atmosphere.

- Develop a set of criteria for evaluating/selecting instruction materials that clearly defines those characteristics materials should have in order to be compatible with CPS curriculum and anti-discrimination policies. Distribute these to district offices and local schools.

- As each review committee is formed to evaluate and select materials for a major subject area, select teachers who adequately represent the ethnic, cultural and racial diversity of the CPS student population.

District Administrators and the Review Process

The survey analysis of district administrative staff was based on responses from 15 district offices. Four out of 15 districts reported having a formal review process, 14 out of 15 were involved in the local school process usually on an as-needed basis and 5 have district staff serving on local school committees. Though district staff enumerated several benefits to be derived from a more active involvement in the local school process, they are peripherally involved at present. The local schools have indicated that they would like the districts to continue their assistance on an as-needed basis.

The analyses of district questionnaire responses in relation to the other surveys leads to the following recommendations:

- Continue the practice of having district staff provide support service to their schools in the process of instruction materials evaluation/selection.

- Include district staff participation in evaluation committees formed by the BIM after they have obtained training in instruction materials evaluation/selection.

- Schedule periodic inservice meetings for district staff conducted jointly by the Department of Curriculum and the Bureau of Instruction Materials on the topic of instruction materials evaluation/selection that also covers general systemwide procedures to follow.

Local Schools and the Review Process

The survey to all school units produced a sizeable return with 422 elementary and high schools responding. Considering that principals are prone to voice objections to a perceived over-abundance of paperwork, this may indicate high interest in the topic. A formal instruction materials evaluation/selection process was reported to exist in 68 percent of the schools. Responsibility is distributed among school-wide committees in 84 percent of the schools, individual classroom teachers in 55 percent of the schools and by grade level or subject area committees in 53 percent of the schools. Despite a high level of activity of school staff in the process, only 34 percent (97) of the schools with a formal process are reviewing materials with clearly defined procedures and guidelines. Further, only 19 percent (55) of the schools with a formal process indicated that materials were reviewed using a set of criteria that considered bias factors.

Since 81 percent of the schools with a formal process (233) do not use any criteria for considering bias factors, responsibility for this critical step in the review process is informally done or merely nonexistent and assumed to be done by committees preparing the "Approved List." These findings justify the following recommendations.

- Develop a cadre of teachers to be trained in the skill of instruction materials evaluation/selection. Likely candidates are teachers who serve in their schools as lead teachers, department chairpersons and resource teachers.
- Increase support service to schools by developing clearly defined criteria, guidelines and procedures against which judgements about congruence of materials with CPS curriculum and anti-discrimination policies can be made.

The Review Process Overall

Combining the analyses of the three surveys reported here with the results of a survey conducted by the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE, 1979) which has documented that 90 percent of instructional time is structured around some instructional material leads to important school policy implications. The primary implication inherent in this finding is that teachers curricular decisions are mediated by the availability of instruction materials. Because of these important implications, the following general recommendations are made:

- Continue the research in the instruction materials evaluation/selection process. Include this topic in a future systemwide needs assessment to determine school practices in instruction materials evaluation/selection. Ascertain support services and information needs of schools through survey and interview methods.
- Based on the additional information obtained in the needs assessment combined with the survey analyses reported here, plan a staff development program that will train school staff in the skills of evaluating and selecting instruction materials.
- Conduct a periodic follow-up of progress being made in improving the instruction materials evaluation/selection process in the CPS using the baseline data and findings discussed in this report.

Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection Process
in the Chicago Public Schools

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Research and Evaluation (DRE), at the request of the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity (DEEO), planned and conducted a study that focused on the congruence between instruction materials used in Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the curricular goals established by the Chicago Board of Education. More specifically this study sought to examine the relationship between board of Education policy designed to promote cultural, ethnic and racial understanding and the instruction materials most widely available and used by CPS teachers and students.

The impetus for this study resulted from the following observation and recommendation as stated in the "Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendation on Educational Components":

> The Chicago public school system offically mandates a single elementary curriculum, [but] the delivery of that curriculum is characterized by a wide variety in teaching methods, choice of textbooks and other materials, general school climate, and achievement outcomes.
>
> (Chicago Board of Education, 1981)

The recommendations have set the following curricular goal:

> Assess the instructional materials in all schools for evidence of cultural bias. Replace biased materials with materials that are pluralistic in orientation.
>
> (Chicago Board of Education, 1981)

The need for local school districts to examine their instruction materials evaluation/selection process is warranted in conjunction with the overall

educational reform movement that is restructuring curriculum requirements and redefining student and teacher competencies. Since a survey conducted by the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE, 1979) has documented that 90 percent of instructional time is structured around some instruction material, the manner in which minorities are presented or excluded from instruction materials is particularly important. The implications are that teachers' curricular decisions are, for the most part, mediated by the availability of instruction materials. Therefore, understanding the process by which instruction materials are made available to students and teachers is a necessary initial step in determining the relationship between the goals of the CPS mentioned above, the curriculum and instruction materials.

The original research proposal contained components that could be studied on a short term, long term or ongoing basis. This necessitated identifying organizational units that are directly involved in the evaluation/selection process. The Bureau of Instruction Materials (BIM) works with subject area specialists (i.e. the director and staffs of an instruction area) each time an instruction area is scheduled for review. The subject areas selected for inclusion in the initial phase of this research study coincided with the evaluation/adoption schedule established by the BIM for the 1984-1985 school year. (Appendix A includes the schedule for each instruction area.)

The formal review of instruction materials at the central office level is the first phase in the process of getting materials into the classroom. To identify this and the intervening steps of what occurs at the district and local school levels, surveys were conducted. This report will describe how teachers, principals and other administrators are involved in the evaluation and selection of instruction materials. Recommendations for action based on

the data presented will enable decision makers, at many levels in the CPS, to assess whether the current system of evaluating and selecting instruction materials furthers curricular and policy goals of the Chicago Board of Education.

The following research questions will be addressed in this report:

- How are teacher committees selected and trained to do textbook evaluation:
- How do selected teachers view their role in textbook evaluation?
- What is the role of district level administrators in the textbook evaluation/selection process?
- What is the role of local school administrators and teachers in the textbook evaluation/selection process?

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION IN PERSPECTIVE

The original proposal for this study identified several methods to employ in order to begin the process of evaluating instruction materials in relation to CPS curricular goals. The objective of the research phase reported here was to gather descriptive information regarding the evaluation/selection process as it currently operates. In order to determine how the current process is functioning throughout the CPS, several audiences were identified to be surveyed: 1. teachers appointed or selected to serve on evaluation/selection committees with the Bureau of Instruction Materials (BIM), 2. district administrative staff, and 3. principals and teachers in each elementary and high school site. By drawing on the work done annually by the BIM in the evaluation/selection of instruction materials, a perspective could be developed to document current policies and practices in use.

The BIM is an arm of the Department of Curriculum (DC) and works jointly with directors of the various subject area bureaus, Pupil Personnel and Special Education Services, and Vocational and Career Education to identify teachers to serve on evaluation committees and to identify textual and nontextual materials to be reviewed. This review occurs in two phases: phase I concentrates on one major instruction area to prepare the approved list that is in effect for 5 years; phase II provides for reviewed materials to be added to existing lists. When an instruction area is scheduled for review, bid packets are prepared with specifications for submitting materials and sent to vendors. In cooperation with the Office of Field Services, district superintendents are requested to nominate teachers who are subject area specialists in the area to be reviewed. Teachers serve for a maximum of 10 working days with substitute service provided to the schools. An orientation

to policies, procedures and responsibilities is scheduled for each committee's first day. Occasionally, when needed, publisher's representatives make presentations to teacher committees. Teachers use criteria check sheets, developed by the BIM with input from curriculum specialists, to assess the quality of materials under review. Evaluation forms are reviewed by BIM staff and lists of reviewed materials prepared for Board of Education approval. Upon approval, microfiche catalogs are delivered to schools, district and appropriate central offices.

Having documented this annual process, which operates similarly for each instruction area, the research concentrated on determining how teachers who serve on committees view their tasks and the level of involvement of district and local school staff in the whole process. Toward this end, evaluators attended the orientation sessions conducted for teachers serving on BIM review committees. In addition, questionnaires were specifically designed for the three levels of individuals to be surveyed. Teacher committees were surveyed on the last of their 4 to 10 day work period with the BIM throughout the 1984-85 school year. District staff were surveyed in February and school staff in March, 1985. The results of each survey will be presented and analyzed in the following three sections.

TEACHER COMMITTEES ASSESS THEIR ROLE IN INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION

Each committee of teachers that is convened in the Bureau of Instruction Materials (BIM), to evaluate instruction materials to be placed on the CPS approved list, receives a one day orientation to their role and tasks to be completed during their 4 to 10 day assignment. Evaluators attended the orientation session to learn how teachers are prepared to review materials. Presentations by the director of the BIM focus on an overview of the bureau and how it serves the CPS, a historical review of textbook controversy at the national level, general and specific criteria for textbook and nontextual review, and the bidding process for potential vendors. Optional presentations are often made by curriculum directors or other administrators who have an interest in the instruction area being reviewed. The curriculum for a specific instruction area is reviewed so teachers see the relationship between concepts to be covered by grade level and materials under review.

A questionnaire was administered by an evaluator, from the Department of Research and Evaluation (DRE), to each teacher committee on the last day of their work period. (See Appendix B for a complete tally of teacher responses.) During the 1984-85 school year four teacher committees reviewed materials for social studies during phase I. In addition, committees reviewed materials to update listings in the area of language arts, guidance and career education, mathematics and science during phase II. A total of 53 certified teachers were recommended to serve on instructional materials evaluation committees at various intervals from October 1984 to May 1985. A profile of teachers serving on review committees appears in Table 1. As reported by the teachers, 39 were recommended by a curriculum director, 6 received principal recommendations, 5 had a district superintendent recommendation, and 1 was selected by the BIM. Among other reasons given, three teachers reported

Table 1

Profile of Teachers Serving on
Instruction Materials Evaluation/Selection Committees
(N=53)

Teacher Characteristics	Number	Percent
Certification		
Certified	53	100
Status		
Regular Classroom Teacher	38	72
Freed Resource Teacher	11	21
Certified Counselor	3	6
Other	4	8
Academic Preparation		
Master's Degree plus additional hours	36	68
Masters Degree	9	17
Bachelor's Degree plus additional hours	4	8
Bachelor's Degree	3	6
Doctoral Degree	1	2
Teaching Experience		
More than 15 years	33	62
11 through 15 years	15	28
6 through 10 years	5	9
Selection to the Review Committee		
Recommended by Curriculum Director	39	74
Principal Recommendation	6	11
District Superintendent Recommendtion	5	9
Selected by BIM	1	2
Representing Chicago Teachers' Union	3	6
Unknown	1	2
Race/Gender		
Black	31	58
White	20	38
Hispanic	2	4
Female	41	77
Male	12	23

representing the Chicago Teachers' Union. Because teachers indicated more than one endorsement, the total reported is greater than 53. This group of teachers was composed of 31 blacks, 20 whites and 2 Hispanics; 41 females and 12 males.

In terms of background characteristics, 38 were regular classroom teachers, 11 were freed resource teachers, 3 were certified school counselors, and 1 each was a coordinator, librarian or resource teacher with a class. Teachers' educational preparation consisted of 1 with a doctorate, 36 with master's degrees plus additional credit, 9 with master's degrees and 7 with bachelor's degrees. Their experience/training in the instructional materials evaluation/selection process was varied. They were asked to respond as classroom teachers and as department chairpersons which is displayed in Table 2. Due to multiple responses, the total is greater than 53.

Table 2

Teacher Experience/Training in the Instructional Materials Evaluation/Selection Process
(N=53)

As a classroom teacher:			As a department chairperson:	
N	%		N	%
41	77	Served on local school textbook evaluation/selection committee	20	38
22	42	Chaired local school text book evaluation/selection committee	15	28
8	15	Previously served on system-wide evaluation/selection committee	5	9
7	13	Submitted materials to system-wide evaluation/selection committee	2	4
6	11	Had specialized training in instructional materials evaluation	2	4

As indicated by their responses, the majority of teachers have had prior experience serving on or chairing local school committees that evaluate and select instruction materials. Though they have served on systemwide committees in other years, their preparation for this task has been through actual experience rather than formal training.

The purpose of surveying teacher committee's was not only to learn what types of teachers are selected but also to have them assess their experience in evaluating and selecting instruction materials. Teachers were asked to rate various sources of information according to how well each prepared them to accomplish the committee's tasks. Sources of information were rated as adequate, inadequate, uncertain or not needed. See Table 3 for a breakdown of teachers' ratings. Over half of the teachers rated elementary curriculum guides as adequate; a little over one-third rated high school guides as adequate. Guidelines for selecting textual materials were rated adequate by over 90 percent of the teachers. Criteria for evaluating textual materials were rated adequate by over 90 percent of the teachers; for nontextual materials, 87 percent rated the criteria as adequate. Various procedures teachers were to follow as a committee member were also rated. Adequate ratings were given to the following: 1) solicitation of bids by vendors (68%); 2) completion of selection criteria form (94%); and 3) reaching a consensus on materials to be approved/disapproved (88%).

Table 3

Teacher Committees Rate Sources of Information
(N=53)

	Adequate Information Given	Inadequate Information Given	Uncertain Information Given	Information Not Needed
1. Curriculum guides for for elementary grades	30	1	0	11
2. Curriculum guides for high school	18	2	1	13
3. Guidelines for selection of textual materials	49	4	0	0
4. General selection criteria for evaluating textual materials	49	3	1	0
5. Evaluation criteria for selection of nontextual materials	46	5	1	0
6. Vendor procedures for solicitation of bids	36	7	3	5
7. Procedures for completing selection criteria form	50	2	0	0
8. Procedures for committee to reach concensus on approving/disapproving materials	47	2	2	0

Teachers did identify areas in the evaluation/selection process which need to be examined more closely. Part C of Appendix B includes all of the teachers' responses. Over half of the teachers felt constrained by time in completing assigned tasks. Informal discussions with teachers verified their concerns that the volume of materials to be reviewed far exceeded their 10 day release

from classroom duties. The BIM is aware of the imbalance in the workload, restrictions on numbers of teachers available and the number of days the Board/Union agreement allows teachers to be released.

A specific area of concern for this report was teachers views regarding judging materials on bias factors, i.e. ethnic, cultural, gender, racial and religious. The majority of teachers (50) indicated that the criteria they received was adequate to evaluate materials on these bias factors. A review of the General Selection Criteria provided to teachers by the BIM for reviewing textual materials (Appendix C) showed that 6 out of 28 items refer to bias factors. The rating sheet used for nontextuals (Appendix D) includes 2 out of 14 items that relate to bias factors. Despite having sufficient criteria for assessing materials on bias factors, nearly one-third of these teachers (17 out of 53) agreed that materials approved by the committee will require teacher discretion in addressing bias factors.

Though two-thirds of the teachers (33 out of 53) disagreed that their task of selecting materials that matched with CPS curricula was problematic, one-third felt it was a problem. In conclusion, one-fourth of the teachers disagreed and over half agreed that presentations by publisher's representatives would help the committee. Teachers were split on whether previous knowledge of a particular publisher's materials influenced their decisions.

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS ASSESS THE PROCESS OF TEXTBOOK EVALUATION/SELECTION

During the second data collection phase, surveys were developed and distributed to the 20 district offices with specific instructions that the questionnaire be answered so that a single response reflected a profile or consensus of all district administrative staff. Appendix E contains a complete tally of all responses. Sixteen districts responded to the survey (one survey was incomplete and not used in the analysis) which included a follow-up several weeks following the initial request. Since the instrument was purposely designed to be answered anonymously, additional follow-up to achieve a 100 percent response was not possible. The discussion will focus on the structure developed by the 15 school districts to evaluate and select materials, the level of staff involvement, and identified information needs.

Of the 15 districts responding, 4 indicated that a formal district-level process for selecting materials was in use. Each has a committee which includes the superintendent, administrator, and instructional and Chapter 1 coordinators. Two districts include other coordinators, principals, teachers, parents and other members of the community. One district reported calling on the services of the Department of Curriculum and the Bureau of Instruction Materials (BIM) for their committee work. These committees included Asian, Black, Hispanic, white, female and male representatives that met on an ongoing basis to review, evaluate, supplement and/or adopt materials.

Fourteen responding districts reported involvement in the local school selection process by providing assistance as needed to local school

committees. In addition, a range of services were provided by district staff as follows:

- 9 districts reviewed requisitions using established criteria
- 8 districts approved or rejected requisitions as per the criteria review
- 7 districts routinely approve all requisitions as submitted by the schools
- 5 districts have district staff serve on local school committees and establish criteria for approving requisitions
- 2 districts suggest appropriate materials and schedule district-wide book fairs or publishers inservices

District administrative staff were then asked to identify the benefits to be realized by having them participate in the local school evaluation/selection process. Twelve districts responded that their participation avails schools of added expertise and experience of specialists who can assist in identifying materials for students with special needs. Other benefits derived from this involvement are identified as follows:

- 10 districts indicated the ability to establish consistency in the types of materials available and in use for students with similar characteristics across the district
- 8 districts sited the ability to ensure that all students in the district are afforded equal educational opportunity of instruction through the quality and equity of available materials and the ability to establish an intradistrict instruction materials exchange program
- 5 districts expect improved district wide student achievement scores by ensuring that current and relevant materials are available to all students.

In order to expand and improve their involvement in the process of instruction materials evaluation/selection, district staff identified information needs. Of the 15 districts responding, 10 selected two primary information needs: 1) specific evaluation criteria (rating scale) by which bias factors could be assessed and 2) assistance from the BIM on an as-needed basis. Having district staff participate in the BIM evaluation committees was a secondary need expressed by 9 districts. Six districts requested 1) specific systemwide guidelines for selecting instruction materials, 2) more detailed information from publisher's representatives and 3) periodic district level inservices conducted jointly by the Department of Curriculum and the BIM. Finally, 5 districts asked for general systemwide procedures for selecting instruction materials and periodic inservice conducted by the BIM.

Through open-ended comments, districts identified other types of assistance needed: 1) a review of new materials at instructional coordinators' meetings, 2) participation of school lead teachers in district level inservices, 3) review of library materials to ensure that materials are available for students with limited English proficiency and 4) guidelines which include criteria for positive representation of racial/ethnic groups.

PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS ASSESS THE PROCESS OF INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION

The final data collection activity included developing and distributing a survey to all elementary and high school units. So that information would be comparable between the district and local school levels, many of the questionnaire items were repeated on both forms. Principals were given the same instruction as district administators, that their response should reflect a school profile. Questionnaires were sent to all school units and were received from 422, 370 elementary and 52 high schools. This analysis will concentrate on the structure used by local schools to evaluate and select materials, the involvement of district staff in the process and types of assistance that would facilitate this annual task. Refer to Appendix F for a complete tally of school responses.

A formal instruction materials evaluation/selection process exists in 288 (68 percent) of responding schools. This process includes a varied combination of activities across schools. In 84 percent of the schools, a school-wide committee is responsible for evaluating and selecting materials for all grade levels and/or subject areas. Committee membership is composed of all available school staff who meet regularly to review and supplement older materials or adopt new materials. In 55 percent of the schools, each classroom teacher evaluates and selects materials for their own class(es) at their own discretion subject to adminstrative approval or only from the approved list. Fifty-three percent of the schools annually form separate grade level and/or subject area committees with all possible school staff involved. Even with school staff actively engaged in the process, in those schools with a formal process, 34 percent (97) of the schools are working with

clearly defined procedures and guidelines for evaluating and selecting instruction materials and 19 percent (55) do so with a set of specific criteria by which materials can be assessed for bias(es). How 32 percent of the schools without a formal process (134) review materials for bias factors was not learned in this survey.

District level participation in the process occurs in 45 percent of the schools. This involvement consists primarily of assistance to local school committees as requested in 31 percent of the schools. Routine approval of requisitions occurs with 19 percent of the schools. Between 3 and 11 percent of the schools involve district staff in their committee work, receive criteria from their district office to use, or have their requisitions accepted or rejected due to a criteria review.

Local schools were to decide if they would derive benefits from having district or central office participation in evaluating and selecting materials. Of the 404 responding to district level participation, 55 percent answered affirmatively. For the 374 responding to central office level participation, 41 percent agreed. To determine the kinds of assistance schools need, they selected among four different levels. Under general assistance, 50 percent of the schools want criteria by which materials can be assessed on bias factors and procedures for the whole process while 41 percent asked for guidelines. From the district level, 77 percent would like assistance from district level personnel on an as-needed basis. Several types of assistance were thought to be beneficial from the central office level: 1) 63 percent for the BIM to be available as-needed, 2) 60 percent asked the same from the Department of Curriculum, and 3) 32 percent want regularly

scheduled inservices conducted jointly by the DC or the BIM. Assistance from outside the school system centered mainly on publishers to make presentations, 76 percent or to provide more detailed information, 43 percent.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The major goal of this study was to examine Chicago Public School (CPS) policy designed to promote cultural, ethnic and racial understanding and the instruction materials used by teachers and students. Identifying the process by which instruction materials are made available to teachers and students was the specific purpose of this report. To assess the involvement of CPS administrators and teachers in the process of evaluating and selecting instruction materials, three surveys were conducted. Conclusions from the findings of these surveys will be used to address the four research questions posed earlier and to formulate recommendations for future action.

Teacher Committees and the Review Process

Procedures used for selecting teachers to serve on BIM evaluation/selection committees identified experienced teachers in their grade level or subject areas. The 53 teachers who worked in the BIM from October 1984 to June of 1985 and completed a questionnaire generally understood their role following the orientation and felt they received adequate information to accomplish their task. However, over 90 percent agreed that their role was understood after the committee's work started. Though 77 percent of the teachers served on a local school committee and 42 percent chaired a similar committee, only 13 percent were familiar with the process of evaluating/selecting materials at the central office level. There is a distinct difference in the skills needed to prepare the "Approved List" and order or select from that same list. Despite their extensive educational preparation and teaching experience, only six teachers had specialized training in instructional materials evaluation through formal coursework. Teachers' unfamiliarity with this process combined with the expectation that they understand and apply guidelines, criteria and

procedures within a short period of time should be cause for concern. Teacher training for materials evaluation/selection needs to be formalized and precede the actual review work.

Half of the teachers (26) served on one of four social studies committees as part of phase I. However, overall, this group being composed of 14 black, 11 white and 1 Hispanic teacher(s) did not reflect the racial proportions of the CPS student population. Since social studies tends to be a sensitive subject area, proportional representation of teachers in terms of CPS cultural, ethnic and racial groups is warranted. This observation extends to gender issues as well since of the 53 teachers surveyed, 41 were females and 12, males.

Though the General Selection Criteria (Appendix C) contained 6 of 28 items referring to bias factors, questions arise as to the operational definitions of such phrases as "scholarly research", "role of women in history and society" and various kinds of stereotypes. The assumption is that selected teachers were informed of the latest scholarly research with regard to minority groups, knew the discrepancies between past and revisionist portrayals of women in history and society and were aware of all the stereotypes to be avoided in instruction materials. The one day orientation teachers received, as observed by evaluators, did not adequately define these issues sufficiently for teachers to exercise fair judgement regarding bias in instruction materials. One-third of the teachers agreed that materials approved by the committee will require teacher discretion in addressing bias factors.

Time constraints, in terms of the amount of materials to be reviewed during the 10 day work period, was of concern to over half of the teachers. Given

these constraints, the ability of teachers to give adequate attention to bias factors in their review may be limited and may result in a cursory review, if at all. Of equal concern was one-third of the teachers stating that their task of selecting materials that matched with CPS curricula was problematic. This may heighten the need for teachers to choose from a variety of materials in their curriculum planning and not be dependent on any one textbook series.

Recommendations. Data from the survey analysis of teachers selected to serve on BIM evaluation/selection committees and informal discussions with them, examinations of documents used in this stage of the review process and discussions and interviews held with administrators from the Department of Curriculum and its bureaus was used to formulate these recommendations:

- Insure that teachers who are selected to serve on instruction materials evaluation/selection committees have received training in this process.
    - Develop a course of study in the skill of evaluating/selecting instruction materials, utilizing university resources, with credit toward lane placement for teachers who qualify.
    - Require that skill in instruction materials evaluation/selection be a prerequisite for teachers who develop the "approved list" that governs the regular instructional program.
    - Restructure the way teachers are scheduled to serve on evaluation/selection committees to alleviate the workload and provide teachers with sufficient time to do quality reviews.
    - Reinstitute teacher committees to work during the summer session to prevent disruption to the instructional program and enable the work to be accomplished in a less pressured atmosphere.
- Develop a set of criteria for evaluating/selecting instruction materials that clearly defines those characteristics materials should have in order to be compatible with CPS curriculum and anti-discrimination policies. Distribute these to district offices and local schools.
- As each review committee is formed to evaluate and select materials for a major subject area, select teachers who adequately represent the ethnic, cultural and racial diversity of the CPS student population.

District Staff and the Review Process

The survey of district administrative staff revealed that 4 out of 15 districts have a formal review process and 14 out of 15 are involved in the local school process usually on an as-needed basis. Between 2 and 9 districts reported providing a range of services to their schools that consisted of reviewing and approving the school's selections. Only 5 districts reported having district staff serving on local school committees. District staff did identify four major types of benefits that would result from having them become more actively involved in the local school process: 1) lending their expertise to insure that students with special needs would be accommodated, 2) establishing consistency in materials-in-use across the district, 3) providing equal educational opportunity of instruction to all students in the district and 4) improving student achievement by ensuring that current and relevant materials are available to all students.

The main question to be raised is why district staff are not more actively involved in the local school process, preferring to respond only as-needed? They may be operating under the assumption that local schools are well informed to effectively execute their responsibility in materials evaluation and selection. Recall that over half of the responding schools foresaw benefits to be derived by having district staff involved.

Recommendations. The analysis of questionnaire responses of district staff in relation to the other surveys suggests the following recommendations:

- Continue the practice of having district staff provide support service to their schools in the process of instruction materials evaluation/ selection.
- Include district staff participation in evaluation committees formed by the Bureau of Instruction Material after they have obtained training in instruction materials evaluation/selection.

- Schedule periodic inservice meetings for district staff conducted jointly by the Department of Curriculum and the BIM on the topic of instruction materials evaluation/selection that also covers general systemwide procedures to follow.

Local Schools and the Review Process

The survey of local schools drew a substantial response with 422 elementary and high schools responding. Sixty-eight percent of the schools (288) admitted to having a formal instruction materials evaluation/selection process in their schools. This responsibility is executed by school-wide committees in 84 percent of the schools, by individual classroom teachers in 55 percent of the schools, or by grade level or subject area committees in 53 percent of the schools. Despite this level of activity among school staff in the process, only 34 percent (97) of the schools with a formal process are working with clearly defined procedures and guidelines for evaluating and selecting instruction materials. In addition a mere 19 percent (55) of the schools having a formal process indicated that materials are reviewed using a set of criteria that considers bias factors. Schools without a formal review process (134) did not have an opportunity to indicate how materials are reviewed with regard to bias factors. The conclusion here is not that local schools are omitting this critical step in the review process but that school committees may assume that materials that appear on the "approved list" have been reviewed for bias. Their review for elimination of bias may be informal.

The implications of these findings take on added meaning when the results of the two previous surveys are considered. Teacher committees working in the BIM have criteria (of questionable validity) to assess materials on bias factors but one-third acknowledged that the materials approved will have to be used with some discretion by classroom teachers. Besides, adequate time to review them was limited. District staff are peripherally involved in the

entire evaluation process. Now 81 percent of the schools with a formal process, acknowledged that criteria for considering bias factors were not included in their review. Since all classroom teachers may not be sensitized to the influence of subtle bias(es) in instruction materials, who has the ultimate responsibility?

Recommendations. The analysis of questionnaire responses of local schools in relation to the other surveys justifies these recommendations:

- Develop a cadre of teachers to be trained in the skill of instruction materials evaluation/selection. Likely candidates are teachers who serve in their schools as lead teachers, department chairpersons and resource teachers. Training could include curriculum coordinators whether at the district or central office level.
- Increase support service to schools by developing clearly defined criteria, guidelines and procedures against which judgements about congruence of materials with CPS curriculum and anti-discrimination policies can be made.

General Conclusions

The results of the analyses of the surveys conducted at the central office, district and local school levels regarding the process of evaluating/selecting instruction materials and the involvement of CPS staff contain important implications for school policy. While there was evidence that many CPS staff are actively engaged in this process at all levels, many are performing tasks and making judgements and decisions without clear direction and guidance. The common need expressed by district and school staff was for support service and specific guidelines and procedures. Since the task of evaluating and selecting instruction materials is complicated, tedious and replete with ambiguities, there is a tendency to defer the decision to the next layer in the school hierarchy. However, in the end, classroom teachers in their use of materials must consider all the subtle and obvious limitations of the

materials made available to them. Recalling that instruction materials comprise 90 percent of instuctional time, the potential for using materials that misrepresents one or more of CPS ethnic, cultural, gender, racial or religious groups is high. Educators must become knowledgeable and skilled and hold publishers accountable to provide CPS students with materials that are congruent with curricular and anti-discrimination policies. Further, educators must draw upon the full range of available instruction materials (nontextual as well as textual) in their curriculum planning to balance the tendency to have a textbook series drive the curriculum. Toward this end, general recommendations are:

- Continue the research in the instruction materials evaluation/selection process. Include this topic in a future systemwide needs assessment to determine school practices in instruction materials evaluation/selection. Ascertain support services and information needs of schools through survey and interview methods.
- Based on the additional information obtained in the needs assessment combined with the survey analyses reported here, plan a staff development program that will train school staff in the skills of evaluating and selecting instruction materials.
- Conduct a periodic follow-up of progress being made in improving the instruction materials evaluation/selection process in the CPS using the baselines data and findings discussed in this report.

REFERENCES

Bernstein, H.T. (1985). "The New Politics of Textbook Adoption." Phi Delta Kappan. 66(7), 463-466.

Doyle, D.P. (1984). "The 'Unsacred' Texts: Market Forces That Work Too Well." American Educator, 8 (2), 8-13.

Dronka, Pamela. (1985). "Will a Third Round of Reform Take the Textbook to Task?" Update (ASCD Newsletter). 27(6), 1, 6-7.

Educational Products Information Exchange. (1977). "Report on a National Study of the Quality of Instructional Materials Most Used by Teachers and Learners". Technical Report No 76. New York: EPIE Institute.

Educational Products Information Exchange. (1979). "EPIE Selection Model." New York: EPIE Institute.

Elliot, D.L., Nagel K.C., and Woodward, A. (1985). "Do Textbooks Belong in Elementary Social Studies." Educational Leadership. 42(7), 22-24.

Farr, R. and Tulley, M.A. (1985). "Do Adoption Committees Perpetuate Mediocre Textbooks." Phi Delta Kappan. 66(7), 467-471.

Green, Robert L. "Student Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools: Recommendations on Educational Components." (1981). Prepared for the Board of Education, City of Chicago.

Kirst, M.W. (1984). "Choosing Textbooks: Reflections of a State Board President." American Educator. 8(2), 18-23.

Komoski, P.K. (1985). "Instructional Materials Will Not Improve Until We Change the System". 42(7), 31-37.

Muther, C. (1985). "What Every Textbook Evaluator Should Know". Educational Leadership. 42(7), 4-8.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1985). "A Study Guide for Issues in Textbook Quality. (draft manuscript). NASBE.

Osborn, J.H., Jones, B.F., and Stein, M. (1985). "The Case for Improving Textbooks". Educational Leadership. 42(7), 9-16.

Rosenberg, Max. (1974). "Evaluate Your Textbooks for Racism, Sexism." in Dunfee, Maxine (Ed.). Eliminating Ethnic bias in Instructional Materials. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Washington, D.C.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1979). Fair Textbooks: A Resource Guide. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Schedule for Evaluating/Selecting Instruction Materials

School Year 9/1 through 8/31	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
INSTRUCTION AREA									
Reading, Elem.& High Sch. Elem. Lit., High Sch. Lab. Dictionaries, Elem. & High Business Ed., Computer Ed. Foreign Languages	E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-3/a	2-3/a	x	E ----|	A 4-3/a	3-e/a	2-e-a
Elem. Language Arts List., Writ., & Speaking Strands, High Sch. Engl.&Lit.		E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-3/a	2-e/a	x	E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-e/a
Fine Arts, Voc. & Pract. Arts Health, P.E., Safety, Driv. Drug, Guid., Counseling and Career Ed., Prekindergarten			E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-e/a	2-e/a	x	E ---|	A 4-e/a
Mathematics, Science Family Life & Sex Ed.				E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-e/a	2-e/a	x	E ---|.
Social Studies, Incl. Proficiency Skills					E ----|	A 4-e/a	3-e/a	2-3/a	x .

E = Evaluation
A = Adoption

-----| = Terminal
4-e/a = 4-year update evaluation/adoption
3-e/a = 3-year update evaluation/adoption
2-e/a = 2-year update evaluation/adoption

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION COMMITTEE
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE (N=53)

I. TEACHER AND COUNSELOR BACKGROUND:

A. Teacher Certification:

1. 53 Certified
2. Name all certificates you hold (indicate area): All grade levels; multiple subject specialties.

B. Status: (Check one.)

1. 3 of 5 Certified School Counselor (Hold Il. State Certificate in Guidance and Counseling)
2. 0 School Counselor (Working towards fulfilling requirements for IL. State Certificate in Guidance and Counseling)
3. 0 School Counselor (Planning to begin to fulfill certification requirements)
4. 38 Regular classroom teacher
5. 0 Off-certificate classroom teacher
6. 11 Freed resource teacher
7. 1 Resource teacher with classroom
8. 3 Other (Specify)

C. Highest academic degree completed: (Check one.)

1. 3 Bachelor's Degree
2. 4 Bachelor's Degree plus some graduate credit hours (Indicate number of additional hours: ___.)
3. 9 Master's Degree
4. 36 Master's Degree plus additional credit hours (Indicate number of additional hours: ___.)
5. 1 Doctoral Degree

D. Teaching experience: (Check one.)

1. 1 through 5 years
2. 5 6 through 10 years
3. 15 11 through 15 years
4. 33 More than 15 years

Counseling experience: (Check one.)

1. 0 1 through 5 years
2. 1 6 through 10 years
3. 1 11 through 15 years
4. 0 More than 15 years

E. Teaching/professional experience which includes guidance, counseling, and career education: (Check all that apply.)

1. 28 self-contained elementary (grades k-8)
2. 17 departmentalized elementary (grades 6-8)
3. 11 elementary lead teacher
4. 22 high school teacher
5. 10 department chairperson (high school)
6. 1 guidance counselor (high school)
7. 1 guidance counselor (elementary)
8. career educatin (high school)
9. 2 career education (elementary)

F. Experience/training in the instructional materials evaluation/selection process: (Answer 1 and/or 2, checking all that apply.)

1. As a classroom teacher, I have

a. 41 served on local school textbook evaluation/selection committee(s).

b. 22 chaired local school textbook evaluation/selection committee(s).

c. 8 previusly served on systemwide evaluation committee(s).

d. 7 submitted materials to systemwide evaluation committees.

e. 6 had specialized training in instructional materials evaluation. (Explain): College courses.

2. As a subject area chairperson or guidance counselor, I have

a. 20 served on local school textbook evaluation/selection committee(s).

b. 15 chaired local school textbook evaluation/selection committee(s).

c. 5 previously served on systemwide evaluation committee(s).

d. 2 submitted materials to systemwide evaluation committees.

3. 2 had specialized training in instructional material evaluation. (Explain):

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

A. How were you selected to participate on this committee?

1. 5 district superintendent recommendation
2. 6 principal recommendatioon

3. 36 recommended by subject area bureau
4. 1 selected by Bureau of Instruction Materials
5. 7 other:

B. Rate the following sources of information according to how well each prepared you to accomplish the tasks assigned to this committee. (Check one response for each item.)

	Adequate Information Given	Inadequate Information Given	Uncertain Information Given	Information Not Needed
1. Curriculum guides for elementary grades	30	1	0	11
2. Curriculum guides for high school	18	2	1	13
3. Guidelines for selection of textual materials	49	4	0	0
4. General selection criteria for evaluating textual materials	49	3	1	0
5. Evaluation criteria for selection of nontextual materials	46	5	1	0
6. Vendor procedures for solicitation of bids	36	7	3	5
7. Procedures for completing selection criteria form	50	2	0	0
8. Procedures for committee to reach concensus on approving/disapproving materials	47	2	2	0

C. In order to plan for effective evaluation of instruction materials through teacher committees, your assessment of this experience will be useful to those who prepare as well as serve on future committees. Answer the following items considering your recent experiences serving on the Instruction Materials Evaluation Committee.

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	No Opinion
1. The tasks assigned to this committee were well specified.	42	11	0	0	0
2. Following the orientation session, I understood my role on this committee.	32	19	2	0	0
3. The committee was provided with the necessary sources of information to accomplish the assigned tasks.	46	5	1	1	0
4. My role on this committee became clearafter the work actually started.	49	2	2	0	0
5. The committee's work proceeded smoothlyonce everyone's role was understood.	49	4	0	0	0
6. Committee members were in agreement as to the interpretation of selection criteria.	43	9	1	0	0
7. The committee was able to reach a consensus on whether to recommend or not recommend instructional materials.	51	2	0	0	0
8. The committee was often in disagreement when making a final decision to recommend or not recommend specific materials.	3	4	42	4	0
9. Information provided by vendors was sufficient for rendering a decision.	22	22	4	5	0
10. The committee felt constrained by time in completing assigned tasks.	10	21	18	3	1
11. The selection criteria were adequate for judging materials on bias factors: ethnic, cultural, racial, religious, and sexual.	36	14	3	0	0
12. The committee was able to approve materials that addressed bias factors named in #11.	29	15	3	2	3

	Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	No Opinion
13. Materials approved by the committee were congruent with Board of Education Policy to promote cultural, ethnic, and racial understanding.	45	8	0	0	0
14. Materials approved by the committee will require teacher discretion in addressing bias factors named in #11.	6	11	30	2	2
15. The task of selecting instruction materials that matched with Chicago Public Schools curricula was problematic.	6	10	33	3	1
16. Presentations by publisher's representatives would be helpful to the evaluation committee.	11	20	14	5	4
17. Previous knowledge of a particular publisher's materials influenced my decision(s) on this committee.	2	20	27	2	1
18. My time spent serving on this committee was worthwhile.	46	6	0	0	0
19. The work of this committee has been well spent in furthering the curricular goals and objectives of the Chicago Public Schools.	48	5	0	0	0
20. I would agree to serve on a textbook evaluation committee again in the future.	47	3	2	1	0

D. Comments: Incorporated in text of report.

E. For research purposes, the following personal data would be useful. Your response is optional.

Racial/
Ethnic: 0 Amer. Indian 0 Asian 31 Black 2 Hispanic 20 White

Sex: 41 Female 12 Male

APPENDIX C

Course Code:_____ Group Code: _____

Name of Series Author Publisher Copyright

_____

Rate each question with score you think it merits.

A - Excellent B- Very Good C - Good D - Fair E - Poor

GENERAL SELECTION CRITERIA

The following general criteria may be applied to instructional materials in social studies.

	A	B	C	D	E
I. CONTENT					
A. Accurate and in agreement with the latest research available					
B. Relates to the goals and objectives of the course					
C. Suitable in terms of reading level and vocabulary control					
D. Charts, maps, tables, accurate clear and concise					
E. Questions encourage reflective processes					
F. Language avoids sexual, racial, religious, and ethnic sterotyping					
II. AUTHOR					
A. Qualified, recognized authority in field					
B. Represents a philosophy of education that is compatible with the philosophy of the Chicago public schools					
III. DATE OF PUBLICATION					
A. Recent copyright date					
B. Appropriateness of changes and/or revisions from earlier editions					
IV. PHILOSOPHY					
A. Minority groups treated in a manner that reflects the latest findings of scholarly research					
B. Material accurately represents the role of woman in history and society					
C. Avoidance of racial, religious and ethnic stereotypes					

	A	B	C	D	E
D. Material non-sectarian					
E. All sides of issues treated fairly and objectively					
V. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS					
A. Binding substantial					
B. Lies flat when open					
C. Type suitable for the grade level					
D. Illustrations pleasing, colorful, and well located on the page					
E. Illustrations accurately reflect the character of our society					
VI. TEACHING AIDS					
A. Directions provided for the teacher in terms of overall aims and objectives					
B. Current references listed for teachers and students					
C. Accompanying audiovisual aids					
D. Work materials challenging for the student and reinforce major concepts presented by the test					
E. Testing materials available					
F. Activities suggested that will challenge youngsters to do further research in meaningful areas					
G. Worthwhile subject indexes					
H. Appropriate glossary					

Committee Signatures

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Material that is basic relates to 80% or more of the objectives of the instructional program.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

_____

Chair: _____

APPENDIX D

COURSE CODE: _____ Group Code: _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR NONTEXTUALS

Title _____

Author _____

Publisher _____ Copyright Date _____

	HIGH ← 4	3	2	→ LOW 1	N/A
Quantity of concepts presented					
Technically correct					
Vocabulary level					
Quality of illustrations					
Quality of color					
Quality of sound					
Multiracial					
Sex stereotyping					
Teacher's guide					
Evaluation tools					
Material adaptable to time allotment					
Need for special hardware					
Safety					
Quality of concepts presented					

Committee Signatures:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ Chair: _____

4 Regularly scheduled meetings to review, evaluate, and adopt new materials. If so, how often?

4 ongoing	___ once per two years
___ twice per year	___ once per three years
___ once per year	___ other (specify)

___ Representation from the following groups:

___ Amer. Indian 1 Asian 4 Black 4 Hispanic 4 White

4 Male 4 Female

2a. Do district administrative staff participate in the local schools' instruction materials selection process in any way?

14 Yes (Complete 2b)
1 No (Go to 3a)

b. If yes, in what way? (Check all that apply.)

5 Serve on local school evaluation/selection committee(s)

14 Provide assistance to local school committee(s) as requested.

5 Establish criteria for approval of instruction materials requisitions.

9 Review all instruction materials requisitions using established criteria.

8 Approve or reject instruction materials requisitions as per criteria review.

7 Routinely approve all instruction materials requisitions as submitted by school(s).

2 Other (please explain) District wide book fair/publishers inservices; provide suggestions of appropriate materials

3a. In your opinion, are there benefits to be realized by district administrative staff participation in the local school evaluation/selection process?

13 Yes (Complete 3b)
0 No (Go to 4)

b. If yes, check below all those benefits that apply.

10 Ability to establish consistency in the types of instruction materials available and in use for students with similar characteristics throughout the district.

APPENDIX E

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

(District Level)
N=15

Directions: This questionnaire addresses the level of involvement of district administrative staff (superintendent et.al.) in the evaluation and selection of instruction materials. It is suggested that this questionnaire be answered so that a single response reflects a profile or consensus of all district administrative staff.

1a. Is there a formal district-level instruction materials selection process in use in your district?

4 Yes (Complete 1b)
11 No (Go to 2a)

b. If yes, which of the following does the process include? (Check all that apply.)

2 Clearly defined district-wide standards for evaluating and selecting instruction materials.

1 Specific criteria by which district administrative staff can determine bias(es) in instruction materials. (Check all that apply)

4 District level instruction materials evaluation/selection committee consisting of: (Check all that apply.)

4 district superintendent
3 district administrator
4 district instructional coordinator
4 ECIA Chapter 1 coordinator
1 special education coordinator
2 bilingual/multicultural coordinator
2 principals
2 teachers
2 parents
students
2 members of community
1 Bureau of Instruction Materials staff
1 Bureau of Curriculum staff
1 Other participant(s) (please explain) Cross Cultural Comm. Coord.

4 Regularly scheduled meetings to review and supplement, where necessary, outdated materials. If so, how often?

4 ongoing
___ twice per year
___ once per year
___ once per two years
___ once per three years
___ other (specify)

8 Ability to ensure that all students in the district are afforded equal educational opportunity of instruction through the quality and equity of available materials.

5 Improved district wide student achievement scores by ensuring that current and relevant materials are available to all students in the district.

12 Avails schools of the added expertise and experience of district level specialists who can assist in identifying materials for students with special needs.

8 Ability to establish an intra-district instruction materials exchange program.

1 Other (please specify) District Instructional Resource Library

4. Which of the following do you think would be useful to the district in evaluating/selecting instruction materials? (Check all that apply.)

6 Specific systemwide guidelines for selecting instruction materials.

5 General systemwide procedures for selecting instruction materials.

9 Participation of district level staff on the central office Instruction Materials Evaluation Committees.

10 Specific evaluation criteria (rating scale) by which bias factors can be assessed.

6 More detailed information from publisher's representatives.

5 Periodic district level inservice conducted by Bureau of Instruction Materials.

6 Periodic district level inservice conducted jointly by Bureau of Instruction Materials and Bureau of Curriculum.

10 Assistance from the Department of Instruction Materials on an as-needed basis.

6 Assistance from the Bureau of Curriculum on an as-needed basis.

2 Other (Specify) Review of new materials at Instructional Coordinators' meetings; participation of school lead teachers in district level inservices; review of library materials to ensure that a variety of material is available for L.E.P. students

5. Further comments, observations, or recommendations regarding the instruction materials evaluation/selection process.

Establish systemwide/district-wide guidelines to include the following criteria: "Positive representation of racial/ethnic groups in content areas, library materials, and audio-visual aides."

6. Please identify below the position titles of those persons who provided input for the completion of this questionnaire. (e.g. district superintendent, instructional coordinator, etc.) SUMMARIZED**

   Dist. Supt., Dist. Adm., Dist. Instr. Coord, ECIA Coord., Guid. Coord, Epec. Ed. Coord. & Instr. Intervention Tchr, Biling. Coord, Headstart Coord, Prin., Tcher, Community mem., Cross Cultural Comty. Coord., and Administrative Asst.

7. For statistical purposes, the following background information on the above persons would be helpful. (Please insert the <u>number of persons</u> in the blanks which match the appropriate description.)

   Highest academic degree completed:

   14 Master's Degree

   31+ Master's Degree plus additional credit hours

   14 Doctoral Degree

Teaching experience:	Administrative Experience:
2 1 through 5 years	12+ 1 through 5 years
11 6 through 10 years	18 6 through 10 years
7 11 through 15 years	6+ 11 through 15 years
33 More than 15 years	9 More than 15 years

** No response = 2
+ Additional responses of check marks only--unknown number of persons

APPENDIX F

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

INSTRUCTION MATERIALS EVALUATION/SELECTION RESEARCH PROJECT

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR/STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

N = 422

Directions: This questionnaire addresses the involvement of the school administrators and faculty in the evaluation and selection of instruction materials. It is suggested that this questionnaire be answered so that a single response reflects a profile of your school.

School _____ Unit ___ ___ ___ ___ [1-4]

1. School Type: Check one of the following: -OR- Check one of the following:

31	Regular K-6 Elementary	30	General High School	
248	Regular K-8 Elementary	7	Vocational High School	
57	Special Elem. (Middle, Classical, Magnet, C.P.C., etc.)	14	Special High School (Academic, Career, Metro., Trade, etc.)	[5]
34	Other _____	1	Other _____	

2. Is a formal instruction materials evaluation/selection process used at your school?

281 Yes (Complete question 3) [6]

134 No (Go to question 4 on page 3)

3. If "yes", which of the following does the process include? (Check all that apply; list continues to page 2.)

a. 97 Clearly defined procedures and guidelines for evaluating and selecting instruction materials. [7]

b. 55 A set of specific criteria by which instructional materials can be assessed for bias(es). [8]

c. 241 A school-wide selection/evaluation committee responsible for evaluating and selecting instruction materials for all grade levels and/or subject areas. Serving on the committee are: (Check all that apply.) [9]

182 principal [10]
142 assistant principal [11]
70 counselor [12]
105 freed resource teacher [13]
152 chairpersons for each elementary grade level [14]
24 chairpersons for each high school subject area [15]

3. Continued

c. 81 selected chairpersons [specify by elementary grade(s) and/or high school subject area(s)]: [16]

_____

_____

56 elementary lead teachers [17]
grade(s) ____/____/____/____/____ [18-22]
120 classroom teacher(s) for each elementary grade level [23]
18 classroom teacher(s) for each high school subject area [24]
30 other participants (please explain) _____ [25]

_____

d. 152 Separate grade level and/or subject area evaluation/selection committees formed each school year which consist of: (Check all that apply.) [26]

107 principal [27]
91 assistant principal [28]
47 counselor [29]
59 freed resource teacher [30]
20 high school department chairperson [31]
65 elementary lead teacher [32]
127 classroom teacher(s) [33]
17 other participants (please explain) _____ [34]

_____

e. 158 Each classroom teacher evaluates and selects instruction materials for his/her class(es) as follows: (Check one only.) [35]

60 From the Approved List(s) only
3 At his/her own discretion [36]
95 At his/her own discretion, but subject to administrative approval

f. 209 Regularly scheduled meetings to review and supplement older materials, where necessary. If so, how often? (Check one) [37]

124 ongoing
21 twice per year
42 once per year
2 once per two years
2 once per three years
17 other (specify) _____ [38]

g. 232 Regularly scheduled meetings to review, evaluate, and adopt new materials. If so, how often? (Check one) [39]

134 ongoing
17 twice per year
51 once per year
6 once per two years
3 once per three years
20 other (specify) _____ [40]

h. 270 Committee members consist of the following ethnic/sex groups:

143 Black/White
63 Black/Hispanic/White
243 Female/Male 18 Female 2 Male [41] [42]
30 Asian/Black/Hispanic/White
28 Other combinations

4. Do district personnel participate in your school's instruction materials selection process in any way?

175 Yes (Complete question 5) [43]
241 No (Go to question 6)

5. If yes, in what way? (Check all that apply.)

11 Serve on local school evaluation/selection committee(s). [44]
120 Provide assistance to local school committee(s) as requested. [45]
28 Establish criteria for approval of instruction materials requisitions. [46]
43 Review all instruction materials requisitions using established criteria. [47]
74 Routinely approve all instruction materials requisitions as submitted by school(s). [48]
32 Approve or reject instruction materials requisitions as per criteria review. [49]
25 Other (specify): _____ [50]

6. In your opinion, are there benefits to be realized by district or central office participation in the local school evaluation/selection process?

District	Central Office	
222 Yes	155 Yes	[51,52
182 No	219 No	

7. Which of the following do you think would be helpful to your school in the instruction materials evaluation/selection process? (Check all that apply.)

A. General assistance such as:

1. 174 Specific systemwide guidelines for evaluating and selecting instruction materials. [53]
2. 210 General systemwide procedures for evaluating and selecting instruction materials. [54]
3. 214 Specific evaluation criteria (such as a rating scale) by which instruction materials can be assessed on bias factors. [55]

B. District level assistance such as:

1. 25 Participation of district level staff on your school's selection committee(s). [56]
2. 91 Regularly scheduled inservice conducted by district level personnel. [57]
3. 323 Assistance from district level personnel on an as-needed basis. [58]

C. Central Office assistance such as:

1. 135 Regularly scheduled inservice conducted jointly by the Bureau of Instruction Materials and Department of Curriculum. [59]
2. 51 Regularly scheduled inservice conducted by the Bureau of Instruction Materials. [60]

C. (Continued)

3. 43 Regularly scheduled inservice conducted by the Department of Curriculum. [61]
4. 265 Assistance from the Bureau of Instruction Materials on an as-needed basis. [62]
5. 254 Assistance from the Department of Curriculum on an as-needed basis. [63]

D. Outside assistance such as:

1. 320 Presentations to staff by publisher's representatives. [64]
2. 181 More detailed information from publishers/vendors. [65]
3. 57 Graduate course on evaluating/selecting instructional materials. [66]

E. ___ Other (Specify): _____ [67]

8. Further comments, observations, or recommendations regarding the instruction materials evaluation/selection process the way it now exists or the way you would like to see it revised.

[74-80=10E5004]
[Dup 1-4]

9. Please identify below the position titles of those persons who provided input for the completion of this questionnaire. (Check all that apply.)

346	principal	73	grade level coordinator	[5,10]
233	assistant principal	54	instructional coordinator	[6,11]
108	counselor	116	resource teacher	[7,12]
72	department chairperson	46	lead teacher	[8,13]
43	head teacher	178	classroom teachers	[9,14]
		22	other _____	[15]

10. For statistical purposes, the following background information on the above persons would be helpful. (Please insert the number of persons in the blanks which match the appropriate description.)

Highest academic degree completed:

67	Bachelor's Degree	[16-17]
122	Bachelor's Degree plus some graduate credit hours	[18-19]
144	Master's Degree	[20-21]
267	Master's Degree plus additional credit hours	[22-23]
78	Doctoral Degree	[24-25]

Teaching experience:		Administrative Experience:		
43	1 through 5 years	69	1 through 5 years	[26-27,34-35]
93	6 through 10 years	62	6 through 10 years	[28-29,36-37]
128	11 through 15 years	84	11 through 15 years	[30-31,38-39]
216	More than 15 years	118	More than 15 years	[32-33,40-41]

Thank you for the time you took to provide us with this important information.

[74-80=20E5004]